

**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
PARK BOARD  
HELD AT CITY HALL  
July 10, 2012  
7:00 PM**

***I. CALL TO ORDER***

Chair Steel called the meeting to order at 7:06 pm

***II. ROLL CALL***

Answering roll call were Members Dan Peterson, Jones, Cella, Deeds, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Hulbert, Gieseke

***III. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA***

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board he would like to add one more item to the agenda and that is the "Garden Park Baseball Renovation Community Notice".

**Chair Steel made a motion, seconded by Member Dan Peterson, approving the meeting agenda as amended.**

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Jones, Cella, Deeds, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Hulbert, Gieseke  
Motion Carried

***IV. ADOPTION OF CONSENT AGENDA***

**Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Member Deeds approving the consent agenda as follows:**

***IV.A. Approval of Minutes – Regular Meeting of Tuesday, June 12, 2012***

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Jones, Cella, Deeds, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Hulbert, Gieseke  
Motion Carried

***V. COMMUNITY COMMENT***

Liz Squires, 5612 Abbott, stated they recently moved to Edina from Philadelphia and that they have two children ages five and two. She noted that the parks are fantastic; however, she was disappointed to see that some of the parks are being treated with lawn chemicals. She stated that she is not exactly sure what is being sprayed because the sign read "this area has been chemically treated please keep kids and pets off for 24 hours". She indicated that she feels like there is a significant amount of scientific data linked to cancer among other issues with these chemicals and she would think there would be some exception to spraying grass that is adjacent to a playground where children play. Chair Steel recommended to the resident to get in touch with Mr. Keprios.

***VI. REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS***

***VI.A. Grandview Small Area Plan Presentation – Kevin Staunton***

Edina Planning Commission Member Kevin Staunton gave the Park Board a "Grandview Small Area Plan Presentation".

Member Dan Peterson asked Mr. Staunton if they looked at what St. Louis Park did with their development on the north side of Excelsior where Trader Joes is. Mr. Staunton replied there was a lot of discussion about that which pointed both to the positive and cautionary in that there have been some real successes as well as some struggles. He added that it was prominently mentioned on more than one occasion as an example of how to think about this in the future with a mixed use of residential and commercial within the same area as well as be very pedestrian friendly.

Member Deeds asked if they had considered the impact this may have on the 50<sup>th</sup> and France area, are you creating a competing district. He noted that area really seems to be thriving the last five years and

has taken quite a leap and wondered if they considered what the economic impact may be. Mr. Staunton replied he thinks what they envisioned is there is a whole northwest quadrant to the City to which some actually head to Eden Prairie rather than 50<sup>th</sup> and France because they perceive it to be closer and more convenient. He noted that vice versa 50<sup>th</sup> and France draws from Minneapolis and is a regional draw. He explained that they were very specific in the guiding principles in talking about this as a neighborhood center and not a regional center. He added that they recognize it does have regional connections to the freeway and potentially the rail; however, they are envisioning this as a neighborhood draw. Mr. Staunton commented he thinks there is enough demand for both.

Chair Steel asked if there was any discussion specifically about the Senior Center as far as parking. Mr. Staunton replied that it did become quite a topic of conversation near the end of the process. He noted there is only one way in and one way out and the people in that area really like the privacy that gives them. He explained that part of what they envisioned was converting Eden/Sherwood into kind of a front door for the library and taking away some of that parking or creating some parking on that street and emptying out directly onto Vernon. He noted they did express concern about that and so they created some alternatives to deal with that. He indicated that one of the things they recommended was to get through the first five year period or at least through the changes being made on Vernon to see if it really does turn into a slower and more pedestrian friendly kind of environment before making those changes. He added that it was driven by things they had heard in the process about the parking at the Senior Center. He commented that it also might be a question of whether the Senior Center is in the right place and maybe the Senior Center becomes part of what's in the Grandview Commons.

Chair Steel asked with regards to adding programming at the Senior Center how much will parking limit their ability to offer programs, is there a certain number of spaces they are looking at. Mr. Staunton replied they are talking about a range from 300 to 400 spaces in the parking lot they are looking at putting in where the old public works building was.

Member Jones indicated that when she looks at implementation she sees phases and phase one has a small programming group that might decide what to do with this and so she is wondering what the Park Board should be doing with that. Should they be asking the City Council or create a working group because she doesn't think this type of small area framework has been done before and therefore is not sure there is a normal process. She commented that she thinks the next natural step would be to create a working group with maybe someone from the Art Center and the Park Board and then people of the community. She stated that she is not sure what the timeframe is or if this is what they envision as the appropriate next step for deciding what the programming is and what the function of this building would be. Mr. Staunton replied that in looking at some of the recommendations as to how to proceed and the timeframes he does envision continued community engagements; however, the question he thinks for the City Council is going to be how that community engagement unfolds. He noted they could divide this into kind of topic areas that do touch many of the boards and commissions and therefore thinks that all of those boards and commissions are going to have to find their piece of this. He indicated that he would encourage the Park Board, like the Planning Commission, to start to think about how they can chart a course and what are the pieces of that you are concerned about and then how can you start to take this vision and try to hang some more structure on it, especially the real centerpiece of the Grandview commons. Also, what is the nature of the programmatic services and do you want a big building or a standalone building or do you see something that is a public/private cooperation or do you do something that's flexible so that when you have a need for more public space you can have it but when you have a need for less public space you can shrink down and expand private space. He encouraged the Park Board to ask the City Council how they want to see it proceed and in figuring out how you can lead that.

Member Gieseke indicated that he knows there is a Transportation Commission and commented that Edina is such a central hub for highways and major roads and he thinks they were talking about a trolley system. He noted as Member Deeds pointed out they don't want to compete with other districts; however, maybe there could be a central theme of conductivity where you could go to 50<sup>th</sup> and France

for a movie and then to the Galleria. He asked Mr. Staunton what was talked about in the Transportation Commission. Mr. Staunton replied that is something they have talked about in the Planning Commission as well as how they could link these various centers within the community whether it's Southdale, 50<sup>th</sup> and France or Grandview which would allow people to get around between them. He stated that with the Transportation Commission more of their focus was how do you kind of unwind the plate of spaghetti that is the Grandview Area to which they felt like they had their hands full with that. He commented that he thinks the point that was raised regarding the connection of 50<sup>th</sup> and France is a good one which they did talk a little bit about and even some discussions about reaching as far as Utley Park and City Hall and it's not out of the realm of possibility certainly for bicycles if not for pedestrians to be stretching that far. He stated it's a good thought and one that he thinks the Transportation Commission and Planning Commission need to be thinking about.

Member Jones asked if she needs to make a motion in order to ask the City Council what the next step should be and if they envision them creating a working group or how else are they going to be engaging the Park Board in this decision. She noted that the first concept she would have is she would definitely want to make sure that there would be representation from the Park Board on whatever group is created to discuss a community center.

Chair Steel commented that they have talked about programming needs for quite a while and feels they are leading up to a bigger discussion about it and she thinks that will help guide their discussion across the City on how to make this space worthwhile for the community. She noted that she sees this as an opportunity they will be working on with their upcoming work plan which does get approved by the City Council.

Mr. Keprios responded that he thinks it's a great suggestion and is something that would be very appropriate to have in a discussion in a joint work session with the City Council rather than make any kind of formal motion. He pointed out this is a very long range plan to which he thinks all options are open and he doesn't think you have to just consider the Senior Center or Art Center but maybe there is a combination and call it an Activity Center. He commented you could also survey the community and get another read if this is the direction you want the community to go and throw out some ideas.

Chair Steel informed the Park Board she would like to continue discussing this at their retreat in August.

#### ***VI.B. User Fee Policy Working Group Recommendations***

Chair Steel informed the Park Board that the major item in this is dealing with the Enterprise Facilities and the per participant fee. She pointed out that staff supports the recommendation with one exception. She commented that much of this was due to the pace of the working group and the pace of City Council did not quite meet up and therefore thinks the working group would be okay with staff's recommendation. Member Kathryn Peterson asked that would striking the words "and residency requirements" to which Chair Steel replied yes.

Member Jones indicated that under the first recommendation it wasn't clear if they are recommending the flat fee or if they find out the variable costs may possibly change to a variable fee and therefore is trying to figure out what is being proposed. Chair Steel replied they are following the current per participant user fee which is the flat fee. She pointed out that under "b" it states they will document variable maintenance costs; however, there is no recommendation to charge based on variable costs at this time.

Member Jones stated that she is trying to figure out philosophically if they want to because it sounds as if they haven't made that recommendation and are recommending to wait to find out what those variables costs are in order to find out. Chair Steel responded that the sentiment was that City Council requested more information on the variable cost and so they want to give them that information; however, the User Fees Working Group was uncomfortable making any decision relating to changes in

charges without seeing that information. Member Kathryn Peterson commented that she interpreted this as being that to continue with the per participant user fee while at the same time gathering more information about variable cost but not necessarily making that change at this time without more information.

Member Jones asked if they are going to be recommending that the User Fee Group start up again in 2014 to review the variable cost to which Chair Steel replied that is not part of the recommendation. Chair Steel explained they don't know how long it will take to put systems in place to collect this information and get a general sense. She noted that she thinks the City Council will be able to see one of the concerns by charging based on variable costs has its own cost with all of the data collection and for all they know this could be a trial of gathering information or it could be long term but until they try it they are not going to make a judgment.

Member Jones indicated that she is trying to figure out the most efficient way for them to try and answer is what we are charging appropriate fees for our activities. She commented that she knows she mentioned the "League of Women Voters" report that was completed in 2010 is fairly extensive of how they came up with user fees and expenses and wondered if the User Fee Working Group used that in their recommendations. Chair Steel responded they did not use that data; they received most of their data from staff and talked with the athletic associations. She noted the main question was how much cost recovery do we want from the athletic associations and they hear loud and clear from the athletic associations that it does get passed on to the participants. Therefore, they did not make a philosophical judgment on what that level should be because we don't have the data to determine what the right amount is. She pointed out they are collecting more data on variable maintenance costs but they are also having more transparency about the association's financial statements and kind of getting it all in line so they can make better decisions down the road.

Member Deeds apologized for not being able to attend last month's meeting when this was discussed but the bottom line is they don't have the data to judge whether football costs more than soccer costs more than tennis, etc. Therefore, the recommendation is that we stay status quo, gather data and figure out where we go from here after they have acquired two or three years' worth of data to which Chair Steel replied that is correct.

Member Deeds commented he is a big fan of data and the idea of being able to do a portion cost and have a good idea of what an hour of 13 year old football costs the City versus what an hour of baseball costs the City he thinks is valuable information just for informed decision making. He stated that what the values of the City are and what they want to do once they understand the variables is a whole different thing. He stated that right now they are shooting blind because they have no idea whether flag football costs more or less than baseball or baseball costs more or less than soccer.

Member Hulbert asked how hard is it to get that information, is it a cost issue and don't they have systems in place to do that. He pointed out that he believes this first started a couple of years ago when they were talking about fees for the athletic associations and were asked why they were charged \$9.00 and they really didn't know. He noted that he thinks it was the Mayor who asked why we have never studied this before. He commented that it sounds like they are at a place now where they have collected what they can collect but are unable to come to any conclusions without more data. Therefore, do they want to pursue it any further or just tell City Council this is what we have and see if they want us to dig deeper than that.

Member Jones commented that at their last Park Board meeting no one seemed to have a problem when she mentioned the "League of Women Voters" report because she believes that report has those numbers. She noted she did propose at their last meeting that the report be handed out and discussed at their next meeting. Member Deeds asked if it was Edina specific to which Member Jones replied it is Edina specific and uses data from 2006, 2007 and 2008. She indicated that the report was produced in

2010 so it does have recent numbers and believes it did come up with both an hourly rate. She stated that she is not sure they need to keep looking for more numbers or if they need to be more specific than what the report states. She noted maybe they can look at this report and discuss philosophically if they agree with Mr. Keprios' philosophy for user fees or if they need a different philosophy.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked if the report explained the sources of the data to which Member Jones replied yes, it came from the Park District. Chair Steel noted that she is very skeptical about the data because they were very adamant about searching for that data firsthand from park staff and their systems do not record that data. She explained that they can break it down for an estimate by the athletic associations but that also includes maintenance for other small pieces of land.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented there are so many shared facilities that it seems like it would be pretty complex to do. Member Jones responded that is why she asked at the last Park Board meeting if anyone had a problem with the data for that report to which Member Kathryn Peterson replied she has never seen the report. Member Jones indicated that when she joined the Park Board the report was handed out to her that year by Mr. Keprios. Member Jones pointed out that she thinks it would save staff some time and it would give them more direction if they looked at this. She asked what more do they need because she doesn't see a clear path for their next step for making decisions from this.

Chair Steel indicated they spoke with staff and were told they do not have variable costs but what they did receive was field maintenance and total revenue from the per participant user fees. She noted also in their budget is total field maintenance cost for 2010; however, you can't just easily break that down by the number of participants or hours because it doesn't work that way. Member Deeds asked Mr. Keprios if they were able to assess maintenance costs by the fields, is there a separate line item so that they can have an understanding of the costs of maintenance, etc., on the fields individually. Mr. Keprios responded on a per field basis per year absolutely not. He explained that it sounds like it might be simple but when you get right down to it it's very complex; who was on the tractor that day for that field, was it a wet season, was it a dry season, did it require fertilizer, how much water was needed, how much were fertilizer costs that year, how many games were played, etc., there are so many variables. He noted they don't track it that way. He commented that it really depends on how complex you want to make this to gather information. He added they take their best shot at a field maintenance budget. We operate under a combination program budget and line item budget and to break it down per field, per hour and cost per kid is going to be a little tough.

Member Hulbert asked how does \$11.00 compare to other cities and do they use a similar system. He asked did they just arbitrarily go from \$9.00 to \$11.00 and is \$11.00 kind of in the ballpark of where the group felt they should be not thinking that we need to charge these groups for every single penny of maintenance costs. He asked do they want to subsidize some of it as a City.

Chair Steel replied she did compare their Parks and Recreation dollars and their user fee revenue to Eden Prairie and the bottom line is you cannot compare that fee from city to city. For example, they have a lot of voluntary associations that cover the costs of referees, uniforms and all sorts of costs that don't tie into this revenue because that revenue is just paying for the city expenditures; therefore, she couldn't compare it. She stated that Eden Prairie gets about three times the amount of revenue; however, she doesn't know how much support they give their youth athletic associations. Chair Steel pointed out that user fees rarely keep up with the rate of inflation and that is something she would like to look at down the line of making sure they are staying above the rate of inflation which she thinks is important.

Member Hulbert asked Mr. Keprios when he sees other parks departments how does that number compare. Mr. Keprios replied he thinks some will tell you they don't charge anything and they take the philosophical approach they are in the business to create a quality of life and raise children and there is no fee. Others charge a \$1.00 an hour fee per use and then there are some that charge a fee similar to ours so it's all over the board and there is no common standard.

Member Gieseke indicated he is really only concerned about fairness and be sure someone is able to explain to him how they came up with that number. He noted that if it is data based and it's bad data then that is inherently unfair; therefore he would rather it be a flat fee and be able to explain to him in a couple of sentences why they charge what it is they charge.

Chair Steel asked Mr. Keprios to explain the background of the User Fee. Mr. Keprios pointed out the User Fee started out at \$5.00 in 1987 and it was basically a request from City Council to find another source of revenue and therefore it was decided to charge a per head nominal fee. They started at \$5.00 per sport per season and they did bring some dollars to the budget but also keep in mind that times were a lot tougher back then and they were worried whether they were even going to meet budget just to keep the grass cut. He added they were one of the first ones to ever do it and a few other Cities have since followed suit. He commented that the fee has slowly increased over the years and now there are assumptions being made that maybe this was intended to cover all of the costs for providing the facility.

Chair Steel stated that she doesn't want to get too much into the discussion right now about what that number is because they do have a chance every year to look at that number and set that rate and be able to have transparency and accountability to their youth athletic associations and say this is what you are paying for and this is what the City asks of you. Tonight's discussion is really data based.

Member Deeds commented that he thinks the issue is not about the parks, it's about the IT infrastructure the City is dealing with. He noted the fact of the matter is we have a lousy cost accounting system, we haven't invested in an IDM infrastructure around here and we don't know what we are spending on much of anything. That's not just about parks; IT has made huge leaps since we probably made any substantial investment in a decent cost accounting system. Until that is put in place and hours are logged and everything else, like a corporation does or anybody else does it but it's an expensive infrastructure investment and it's not a Park Board infrastructure investment, it's a City investment that the City Manager ought to be dealing with. He noted until that time there is no sense in actually asking staff to try and break this down any further because you just don't have the information and the ability to easily capture the costs of getting somebody out and logging every hour or every 15 minute increment that they spend on which field, etc. He commented they could do a short sample of a month or something but a month is not a month is not a month and so he doesn't know what you could make of the data. Therefore, until there is a substantially better IT infrastructure in which the City really is doing a decent cost accounting the variable costs are next to impossible to track.

Member Kathryn Peterson noted that she would also say then that you could expand that to say are the activities at the Senior Center being appropriately priced and are the activities at the Art Center being appropriately priced and all of that because you could philosophically go down that same path.

Chair Steel stated as far as the recommendation on variable costs the wording allows the City Council to decide the depth of that data collection. Member Jones stated just to clarify the recommendation is to keep the flat costs one rate and supports the current participant fee. Therefore, there are two pieces it's supporting first, the \$11.00 charge with this statement to which Chair Steel replied it does not state that, it states it supports the current participant user fee practice. Member Jones asked so it only talks about the practice of the flat fee. Member Cella responded a flat fee based per head rather than per hour or per game per anything else per head.

Member Jones asked if they are suggesting that "until" further information to which Chair Steel replied there is no "until" it just states "we support continuing it". Member Jones stated that it says "without further information on variable field maintenance costs" and asked Chair Steel if she wants to strike that and say "we support the current per participant user fee practice". Chair Steel noted that it's just saying the rationale of the user fees working group's recommendation.

Member Jones commented the reason she asks is because of that rationale then the next step you are saying is that you recommend the variable maintenance costs and it states you want to pursue something that may not be flat to which Chair Steel replied no. Member Jones responded she is just trying to figure this out, first they are going to be recommending that they keep the flat fee and secondly they are going to collect data to which Chair Steel noted to justify future increases, whatever that means. Member Jones asked could that mean they just want to do it in aggregate to which Chair Steel asked that would be the current accounting. Member Jones replied she is just wondering do they need to break it down between baseball and hockey, she shouldn't use hockey because it's not a field base, but do they need to have or try to have lacrosse be split up from these other field based sports. Chair Steel explained the rationale for that was City Council asked them to evaluate the variable maintenance costs so this is just addressing City Council's requests and getting them that information without making changes to the current practice.

Member Deeds asked for a little clarity, so there is a per participant user fee that the EFA and the Lacrosse Association, etc., pays and asked do they pay any other fees such as a rental for the field or an hourly rental fee for the field, etc. Chair Steel replied that in the matrix she previously provided there is an hourly gym fee rental for some associations as well as she believes the Edina Hockey Association pay a rental fee for the arena. Member Deeds asked about the field sports they are talking about. Member Kathryn Peterson replied she knows for baseball they pay an additional fee for tournaments. Member Deeds asked if the normal season is simply covered by the per participant fee to which Chair Steel replied that is correct. Member Jones commented that for Basketball they are charged a per participant fee and then are they also charged an hourly fee for the gyms to which Member Steel replied correct. Member Jones asked so every time they practice they pay an hourly fee on top. Mr. Keprios replied that is correct and explained that now for any school owned athletic facility they will now pay an hourly rate for either gym use, swimming or athletic fields and that is new this year. Member Kathryn Peterson asked does that go to the school district to which Mr. Keprios replied yes because it is owned and operated by the Edina School District and they set their own fees. Member Kathryn Peterson asked so from the City's perspective it's just a pass through to which Mr. Keprios replied from the City's perspective there is currently no hourly fee for fields unless it's for a fundraiser tournament or something not part of the typical program offering.

Member Jones indicated that the schools are maintaining the gyms and the City does not have any costs involved to which Mr. Keprios replied no that is not the case. For the "City Gyms", the city pays 100% of all of the operating expense and capital expense for 30 years. Member Jones asked if those gyms are included in these hourly fees to which Mr. Keprios replied yes, they still pay an hourly fee for those gyms as well. Member Jones indicated that those sports are being charged more by the City because they have the per participant fee and the hourly fee. Mr. Keprios pointed out that the City does not collect the hourly rental fees for the gyms, the school does to which Member Jones asked even for the City gyms. Mr. Keprios explained that the revenues collected for the two City gyms is then taken off of the operating expense invoice that they get so the City is credited back those revenues. He added that the School District also pays an hourly fee for their use of the two City gyms. That is the way the facility use agreement was written.

Member Jones stated that she knows if other people want to rent the gyms or the fields she believes it costs \$48.00 an hour to which Mr. Keprios replied correct. Member Jones asked is that the market rate to which Mr. Keprios replied that is what they analyze to be pretty close to covering their costs. Member Jones commented they are charging \$11.00 a field to which Mr. Keprios replied \$11.00 per participant per season. Member Deeds stated if you look at EFA that amounts to approximately \$6,000. Member Cella commented that it shows on the appendix for the basketball association in 2010 it was \$15,000 and for 2011 it was \$11,790 so they are not really comparing the cost of the field on a per hourly cost because you are doing heads versus hours so it's a different comparison.

Chair Steel indicated that the question before the Park Board is do you agree with these recommendations or not. Member Dan Peterson stated the answer is yes.

Member Dan Peterson made a motion, seconded by Chair Steel, to approve as Mr. Keprios put in his memo to the Park Board with the exception of the “residency”.

Member Deeds asked what are they approving, the entire document to which Member Dan Peterson replied yes the entire document. Chair Steel added the entire document with the exception on Item 3.b. elimination of “and residency requirements”.

Member Hulbert commented where it states “we recommend that associations that exclusively use enterprise facilities are exempt from the per participant user fee and requirements, because they pay competitive hourly fees to use these facilities” was that worded like that for the Edina Swim Club. He stated because they have no other pool, they are paying hourly to use the pool and so we determined that was fair for them not to have to pay a participant fee to which Chair Steel replied correct. Member Hulbert asked do they run the risk if they word it like that because an association may pull away from any of our park facilities and so we use just enterprise facilities. He noted that as an example in the winter would the EHA ever say we are not going to use your outdoor rinks we are just going to use Braemar Arena and just use the rinks when we feel we can and they are open. Do you see that as a risk at all? Mr. Keprios replied he doesn’t believe so and that the philosophy of the enterprise facilities is ideally they would like to have them all pay their own way but that has not been the philosophy for all of the non-enterprise athletic facilities.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Jones, Cella, Deeds, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Hulbert, Gieseke  
Motion Carried.

#### ***VI.C. 2012 Human Services Task Force***

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board in their packet Manager Neal is asking that the Park Board get a volunteer to serve on the Human Services Task Force. Member Cella commented that it’s an area of interest for her but unfortunately the heaviest dates run right up against election season and she staffs the absentee ballot office and would therefore be unavailable at that time.

Chair Steel commented if anyone is interested to please contact Mr. Keprios.

#### ***VI.D. Countryside Park Shelter Building Working Group***

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that it would be nice to have one or two Park Board members serve on a working group to work with an architect to design what will be the new replacement park shelter building for Countryside Park. Member Hulbert stated that he would do it.

Member Dan Peterson asked Mr. Keprios if the “Waters Development” have paid. Mr. Keprios replied they have a deadline of July 20<sup>th</sup> and that they have already submitted their plans to the Building Department for approval; however, before they can be issued the permit they have to give them the check.

#### ***VI.E. Sports Dome Working Group Phase II Update***

Ms. Kattreh informed the Park Board they have a meeting next Thursday, July 19<sup>th</sup> at 7:30 am where they will be discussing the location. She noted they have been given the direction by the City Council to discuss location and to eliminate school district facility sites as well as any neighborhood sites. She indicated they are looking for input regarding site and location from anyone in addition to their committee members.

#### ***VI.F. August 13, 2012 Park Board Retreat***



Chair Steel informed the Park Board that their retreat has been scheduled for Monday, August 13<sup>th</sup> and noted it will not only have team building but she would like them to really focus on their work plan and what that actually means. She noted she would like to walk out of the retreat having a sense of accomplishment and welcomes anyone's suggestions or concerns to make this a better retreat.

Member Hulbert made a motion, seconded by Member Gieseke, that the August Park Board meeting be a retreat that is still an opening meeting to the public.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Jones, Cella, Deeds, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Hulbert, Gieseke

Motion Carried.

Member Jones made a motion, seconded by Member Cella, if the retreat needs to be televised since their August meeting is supposed to be televised that they reschedule the retreat to September.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Jones, Cella, Deeds, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Hulbert, Gieseke

Motion Carried.

#### ***VI.G. Garden Park Baseball Renovation Community Notice***

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board this item came up literally this afternoon. He noted that Ms. Kattreh and he met with the President of the Edina Baseball Association and another fellow board member to talk about their desire to make some improvements to Garden Park. He explained they want to fast track this as a possibility and the question was raised whether or not they will need to have a public process to make these improvements and he would like Park Board to weigh in on that decision. He pointed out that they want to add dugouts similar to what you see at the Courtney fields as well as add some batting cages, fencing modifications and additions as well as incorporate some electronic scoreboards. At this time they are not requesting lighting.

Member Hulbert stated that the dugouts are probably long overdue as well as there are some improvements that are needed there with the fencing and batting cages. He indicated that with Garden Park there are no houses that look right on it so he doesn't know that a scoreboard is something that would necessarily panic people like it does at Pamela. Member Kathryn Peterson pointed out they are looking at a smaller scoreboard to which Mr. Keprios added he would envision it to what you see at Braemar fields #2, #3 and #4. Member Kathryn Peterson stated that she would agree with what Member Hulbert is saying in that she doesn't know that it would be a significant enough change.

Member Deeds indicated that given their experience with a conversation they had in May regarding the baseball diamond and the extension of the soccer field he would encourage a public process. He noted that he thinks these changes are no more substantial than those changes and they ended up having a public discussion. Member Hulbert replied in that situation they were taking something significant away from the neighborhood. Member Kathryn Peterson stated there is already a ball field with fences all the way around so it really can't be used for anything else except maybe flag football in the outfield and even those changes wouldn't change that.

Member Hulbert asked if the batting cages would be along the first baseline to which Mr. Keprios replied yes. Member Hulbert noted that is open space there that is not being used for anything. Mr. Keprios commented that it's an area used for warm ups but there are no picnic tables.

Chair Steel stated that in her opinion on sending out notices is to always error on the side of getting public comment and if it's not a big issue they won't need to spend a lot of time on it; therefore, she doesn't think it would be a waste of time and it's keeping the community engaged.

Member Hulbert asked why EBA wants to fast track this to which Mr. Keprios replied they have some dollars they want to donate and would like to get moving on the project right away. Member Kathryn Peterson commented that she thinks the other reason is Edina is hosting the 2013 Legion State Tournament and they would like to have another field besides Braemar Field #1 for the Tournament.

She added they would like to make decent improvements so that it's worthy of being a state tournament field.

Member Jones asked if they did a public process how long would that take to which Mr. Keprios replied in this case because of the August Park Board meeting being a retreat he would send out notices to everyone within 1,000 feet of the park which will give them an opportunity to write letters, e-mails and attend the September Park Board meeting.

Member Deeds indicated not knowing the site and scope of the changes how would this compare to other projects of this kind of scope and what process was used. Member Kathryn Peterson responded that she would compare it to the dugouts at Countryside to which Mr. Keprios pointed out the dugouts at Countryside Park did not involve a public process. Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that at Pamela Park where they put in fencing on the softball field that did not have fencing they did not have a public process and the neighborhood was very upset about that. He noted if they were adding fencing it would change the character and use of that space for the neighbors and rightfully so there should have been public input; however, in this case he doesn't think it changes the use of the park for the neighbors other than the one batting but he doesn't want to presume, he is not going to make that call anymore.

Member Deeds asked if they were to approve this at the September Park Board meeting would that give enough time to put this in and have it ready for the Legion Tournament in 2013? Mr. Keprios replied he believes so because part of the project involves just the renovation of the field itself and because that is just improving what is already there it does not require public process. He noted the addition of dugouts, bleachers, scoreboards and batting cage is all new but could easily wait until September. He added that he thinks there is enough change going on that it is probably worth going through the public process. Member Gieseke commented that he would agree. Member Kathryn Peterson stated that she thinks it's important to characterize the changes as minor.

Member Jones made a motion seconded by Member Cella, that they create a public process for the improvements at Garden Park.

Ayes: Members Dan Peterson, Jones, Cella, Deeds, Steel, Kathryn Peterson, Hulbert, Gieseke  
Motion Carried.

## ***VII. CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS***

None

## ***VIII. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS***

Chair Steel indicated the Fourth of July Parade was a really fun experience and thanked the staff for getting them the materials.

Member Kathryn Peterson commented a couple of notes for the future, the amount of Frisbees was perfect; however, the coupons were a little bit unwieldy and they probably need to talk about how to do that in the future.

Member Kathryn Peterson asked about the status of Edinborough because she saw there was a blog opening it up for public comment and the way the changes were described, specifically around the planting, it caused a response where someone said they hoped we are not getting rid of all of the plantings. She indicated that she thinks the verbiage might need to be changed because it implies that more of the plantings are going to be gone than what was proposed to be gone.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that Ms. Kattreh has done a wonderful job of altering the power point presentation on the Edinborough Study that the Park Board saw and will be delivering it to the City Council next Tuesday. He noted that not much has changed other than Park Board's review and comments will be noted on the report and recommendation.

***IX. CHAIR AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS***

Mr. Keprios thanked the Park Board members who participated in the parade and noted that later in the agenda or work plan if this is something Park Board would like to do again he would love some input and maybe next year have a little more time to better prepare. He noted maybe there are some other creative ideas you may want to incorporate but he thought it was a really fun idea.

Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that it was very successful and he was very appreciative that they allowed the Veteran's Committee to advertise what they are up to. The committee and a variety of volunteers tied 4,000 yellow ribbons to flags that said "Please Support the Veteran's Memorial" which was excellent. He added that Former Parks Director Bob Kojetin did a wonderful job of putting together a model display replica of the central focal piece that includes the granite marker and sculpture. The model will show what it's going to look like as far as size and shape and he appreciates all of the support for that.

Member Dan Peterson asked if there were any updates on fundraising for the Veteran's Memorial Committee. Mr. Keprios replied he has now given 15 presentations and they have received some money here and there. He noted that he has to wait for the latest report from Dick Crockett because he has been on vacation. He commented that he thinks between in-kind support and pledges and verbal pledges they are approaching the \$200,000 mark; however, he can't validate that because they don't have the up-to-date figures but does think they are getting close to that.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm